

Partially locally atomic models

著者	Okamoto Keishi, Wakai Kentaro
journal or publication title	Tsukuba journal of mathematics
volume	22
number	1
page range	235-240
year	1998-06
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/100564

PARTIALLY LOCALLY ATOMIC MODELS

By

Keishi OKAMOTO and Kentaro WAKAI

1. Introduction

Various atomic models are useful tools for stability theory. We know the following about atomic models.

- 1) If T is ω -stable then for every set there is an atomic model over it.
- 2) If T is superstable then for every set there is an a-atomic model over it.
- 3) If T is stable then for every set there is a locally atomic model over it.

In the present paper we introduce a condition on a theory called partial stability (see definition 1), which is a generalization of stability. We also define the notion of a partially locally atomic model (see definition 5). Then we have

THEOREM 6. *If T is partially stable (stable in P), then there is a partially locally atomic model (locally atomic with respect to P) over any countable set in P .*

2. Preliminaries

Let T be a countable theory in a language L and $P(x)$ an L -formula with only one free variable. As usual, we work in the big model \mathcal{M} of T . M denotes an elementary submodel of \mathcal{M} . We write A, B, \dots for subsets of \mathcal{M} . λ denotes an infinite cardinal.

We write P^A for $\{a \in A : \mathcal{M} \models P(a)\}$. We abbreviate $P(x_1) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n)$ as $P(\bar{x})$ where $\bar{x} = x_1 \dots x_n$. We abbreviate $(\forall \bar{x})[P(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})]$ as $(\forall \bar{x} \in P)\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$. Let $p(\bar{x})$ be a type (could be partial). We write $p_{\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})}(\bar{x})$ for the restriction of $p(\bar{x})$ to $\{\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y}), \neg\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})\}$ and $S_{\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})}(A)$ for $\{p_{\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})}(\bar{x}) : p(\bar{x}) \in S(A)\}$. We write $p_{\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})}$ as p_φ and $S_{\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})}$ as S_φ , if there is no confusion.

We define two partial stability conditions and show related lemmas.

DEFINITION 1. (1) T is λ -stable in P if for all A , $|A| \leq \lambda$ implies $|\{p(\bar{x}) \in S(A) : P(\bar{x}) \in p(\bar{x})\}| \leq \lambda$. T is stable in P if T is λ -stable in P for some λ .

2) T is λ -stable over P if for all A , $|A| \leq \lambda$ and $A \subset P^{\mathcal{M}}$ imply $|S(A)| \leq \lambda$. T is stable over P if T is λ -stable over P for some λ .

FACT 2 (The unstable formula Theorem [2] II.2.2). *The following properties of a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ are equivalent:*

(1) $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ is unstable;

i.e., for every $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$, there is a set A such that $|S_\varphi(A)| > \lambda \geq |A|$.

(2) $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ has the order property;

i.e., $\{\varphi(\bar{x}_i\bar{y}_j) : i < j < \omega\} \cup \{\neg\varphi(\bar{x}_i\bar{y}_j) : j \leq i < \omega\}$ is consistent.

(3) There are a set A and a type $p \in S_\varphi(A)$ such that p is not A -definable.

LEMMA 3. T is stable in P if and only if T is stable over P .

PROOF. T is unstable in P

\Leftrightarrow There is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ such that $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$ is unstable

Let $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{y}) = \varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$

$\Leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ (parameters are in \bar{y}) has the order property (By Fact 2)

$\Leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{y}\bar{x})$ (parameters are in \bar{y}) has the order property

$\Leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{y}\bar{x})$ is unstable (By Fact 2)

$\Leftrightarrow T$ is unstable over P . □

LEMMA 4. Let T be stable in P . Then for each L -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$, for each tuple $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{M}$ and for each set A , there is an $L(P^A)$ -formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models [\varphi(\bar{b}\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{b})]$ for all $\bar{b} \in P^A$. If $A = M$ and $\bar{a} \in M$ then $M \models \forall \bar{x} \in P[\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x})]$.

PROOF. Since T is stable in P , $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$ is stable. By the similar argument in Lemma 3, $\varphi(\bar{y}\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{y})$ also does not have the order property. By (3) \Leftrightarrow (2) of Fact 2, $p(\bar{x}) = tp_{\varphi(\bar{y}\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{y})}(\bar{a}/P^A)$ is P^A -definable. Hence there is an $L(P^A)$ -formula $\psi(\bar{y})$ such that for all $\bar{b} \in P^A$, $\varphi(\bar{b}\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{b}) \in p(\bar{x})$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} \models \psi(\bar{b})$. Hence $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b}\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{b})$ for all $\bar{b} \in P^A$. □

3. Main Theorem

First recall the definitions concerning local atomicity. Let $p(\bar{x})$ be a type over A . The type $p(\bar{x})$ is locally isolated if for each L -formula $\theta(\bar{x}\bar{y})$, there is an $L(A)$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in p(\bar{x})$ such that $\varphi(\bar{x}) \vdash p_{\theta(\bar{x}\bar{y})}(\bar{x})$. Let $B \subset A$. The set A is said to be

locally atomic over B if $tp(\bar{a}/B)$ is locally isolated for any $\bar{a} \in A$. We now define the notion of local atomicity with respect to P .

DEFINITION 5. *Let $B \subset A$. A is locally atomic over B with respect to P if P^A is locally atomic over P^B .*

The next theorem is our main theorem. From now on, by a subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$, we mean a subset of $(P^{\mathcal{M}})^n$ for some natural number n if the value of n is irrelevant for the argument.

THEOREM 6. *Let T be stable in P and A a countable set. If every $L(A)$ -definable subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$ is $L(P^A)$ -definable then there is a countable model $M \supset A$ such that M is locally atomic over A with respect to P .*

To prove Theorem 6 we need a fact and a lemma.

FACT 7 (Transitivity of local atomicity [1] IX. 5.7 Lemma). *If $A \subset B \subset C$, C is locally atomic over B and B is locally atomic over A then C is locally atomic over A .*

LEMMA 8. *Let T be stable in P , B a countable set and $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in L(B)$. If every $L(B)$ -definable subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$ is $L(P^B)$ -definable then there is a countable set $C \supset B$ such that:*

- (1) φ has a realization in C ;
- (2) C is locally atomic over B with respect to P ;
- (3) Every $L(C)$ -definable subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$ is $L(P^C)$ -definable.

PROOF OF LEMMA. Since T is stable in P , $R(P(\bar{x}), \theta(\bar{x}\bar{y}), 2) < \omega$ for any L -formula $\theta(\bar{x}\bar{y})$. So we can choose a type containing $\psi(\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$ and is locally isolated for every formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ which is consistent with $P(\bar{x})$.

By the consistency of $\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$, we consider two cases.

(Case 1) $\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$ is consistent.

This is the easier case. We can choose a tuple $\bar{a} \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{x}) \in tp(\bar{a}/B)$ and $tp(\bar{a}/B)$ is locally isolated. So for every L -formula $\theta(\bar{x}\bar{y})$, $tp_{\theta}(\bar{a}/P^B)$ is isolated by an $L(B)$ -formula which is in $tp(\bar{a}/B)$. Since every $L(B)$ -definable subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$ is $L(P^B)$ -definable, $tp_{\theta}(\bar{a}/P^B)$ is isolated by an $L(P^B)$ -formula which is in $tp(\bar{a}/B)$. So $tp(\bar{a}/P^B)$ is also locally isolated. Let $C = B\bar{a}$.

By the construction of the set C , C satisfies (1) and (2). We show that C satisfies (3). Let $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ be an L -formula and $\bar{c} \in C$. Suppose that $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{c})$ defines a subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$. And suppose that $\bar{c} = \bar{a}'\bar{b}$ for some $\bar{a}' \subset \bar{a}$ and $\bar{b} \in B$ and $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b})$ defines a subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$. Since every $L(B)$ -definable subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$ is $L(P^B)$ -definable, there is an $L(P^B)$ -formula $\theta(\bar{x}\bar{y}')$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \forall \bar{x}\bar{y}' \in P[\psi(\bar{x}\bar{y}'\bar{b}) \leftrightarrow \theta(\bar{x}\bar{y}')]$. Since $\bar{a}' \in P^C$, $\mathcal{M} \models \forall \bar{x} \in P[\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b}) \leftrightarrow \theta(\bar{x}\bar{a}')]$. Thus the set C satisfies (3).

(Case 2) $\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge P(\bar{x})$ is inconsistent.

This is the harder one. We construct a set C and a realization \bar{a} of $\varphi(\bar{x})$ so that every $L(B\bar{a})$ -definable subset of $P^{\mathcal{M}}$ is $L(P^C)$ -definable. Since B is countable, let $\{\psi_i(\bar{x}\bar{y}_i\bar{b}_i) : i < \omega\}$ be an enumeration of all consistent $L(B)$ -formulas. By induction on i , we construct a sequence $\bar{c}_0, \bar{c}_1, \dots$, and L -formulas $\theta_i(\bar{y}_i\bar{z}_i)$ ($i < \omega$) satisfying the following properties:

- (i) $C_i = B \cup \{\bar{c}_j : j < i\}$;
- (ii) C_{i+1} is locally atomic over C_i with respect to P ;
- (iii) \bar{c}_i is a realization $Q_i(\bar{z}_i)$ where

$$Q_i(\bar{z}_i) = P(\bar{z}_i) \wedge \exists \bar{x} \left[\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j < i} \forall \bar{y}_j \in P[\psi_j(\bar{x}\bar{y}_j\bar{b}_j) \leftrightarrow \theta_j(\bar{y}_j\bar{c}_j)] \right. \\ \left. \wedge \forall \bar{y}_i \in P[\psi_i(\bar{x}\bar{y}_i\bar{b}_i) \leftrightarrow \theta_i(\bar{y}_i\bar{z}_i)] \right].$$

Suppose that \bar{c}_j and θ_j are defined for $j < i$. Let \bar{a}_i be a realization of $R_i(\bar{x})$ where

$$R_i(\bar{x}) = \varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j < i} \forall \bar{y}_j \in P[\psi_j(\bar{x}\bar{y}_j\bar{b}_j) \leftrightarrow \theta_j(\bar{y}_j\bar{c}_j)].$$

By applying Lemma 4 to $\psi_i(\bar{a}_i\bar{y}_i\bar{b}_i)$, we can choose an L -formula $\theta_i(\bar{y}_i\bar{z}_i)$ and $\bar{c} \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \forall \bar{y}_i \in P[\psi_i(\bar{a}_i\bar{y}_i\bar{b}_i) \leftrightarrow \theta_i(\bar{y}_i\bar{c})]$. Hence we get an L -formula $\theta_i(\bar{y}_i\bar{z}_i)$ such that $Q_i(\bar{z}_i)$ is consistent. Then we can choose a type $p(\bar{z}_i) \in S(C_i)$ which contains $Q_i(\bar{z}_i)$ and is locally isolated. Let \bar{c}_i be a realization of $p(\bar{z}_i)$. Thus \bar{c}_i and θ_i are defined. Then

$$\Psi(\bar{x}) = \{\varphi(\bar{x})\} \cup \{\forall \bar{y}_i \in P[\psi_i(\bar{x}\bar{y}_i\bar{b}_i) \leftrightarrow \theta_i(\bar{y}_i\bar{c}_i)] : i < \omega\}$$

is consistent. Let \bar{a} be a realization of $\Psi(\bar{x})$. Put $C = \bigcup_{i < \omega} C_i \cup \bar{a}$.

The set C clearly satisfies (1). Indeed $tp(\bar{c}_i/P^{C_i})$ is also locally isolated for all $i < \omega$. So C satisfies (2) by Fact 7. To show that C satisfies (3), we may assume the following without loss of generality. Let $\bar{c} \in C$ and $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ an L -formula.

Suppose that $\bar{c} = \bar{a}' \bar{b} \bar{c}'$ for some $\bar{a}' \subset \bar{a}$, $\bar{b} \in B$ and $\bar{c}' \in P^C \setminus P^B$ and suppose that $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b}\bar{c}')$ defines a subset of P^M . It suffices to show that $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b}\bar{c}')$ is equivalent to an $L(P^C)$ -formula. By the choice of $\{\psi_i(\bar{x}_i\bar{y}_i\bar{b}_i) : i < \omega\}$ and \bar{a} , every $L(B\bar{a})$ -definable subset of P^M is $L(P^C)$ -definable. Then for the $L(B\bar{a})$ -formula $\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b}\bar{c}')$, there is an $L(P^C)$ -formula $\theta(\bar{x}\bar{y}')$ such that $M \models \forall \bar{x}\bar{y}' \in P[\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b}\bar{c}') \leftrightarrow \theta(\bar{x}\bar{y}')]$. Since $\bar{c}' \in P^C$, $M \models \forall \bar{x} \in P[\psi(\bar{x}\bar{a}'\bar{b}\bar{c}') \leftrightarrow \theta(\bar{x}\bar{c}')]$. So C satisfies (3). \square

With Fact 7 and Lemma 8, we now prove Theorem 6.

PROOF OF THEOREM 6. We construct countable sets A_i ($i < \omega$) by induction on i .

(Step 0) $A_0 = A$

(Step i) Suppose that A_i is defined. We construct countable sets B_i^j ($i, j < \omega$) by induction on j .

(Substep 0) Let $B_i^0 = A_i$ and $\{\varphi_i^j(x) \in L(A_i) : j < \omega\}$ be an enumeration of consistent $L(A_i)$ -formulas.

(Substep j) Suppose that B_i^j is defined.

(Case 1 of Substep j) B_i^j has a realization of $\varphi_i^j(x)$.

Put $B_i^{j+1} = B_i^j$

(Case 2 of Substep j) B_i^j has no realization of $\varphi_i^j(x)$.

By Lemma 8, there is a set $C \supset B_i^j$ with following properties:

- (i) $\varphi_i^j(x)$ has a realization in C ;
- (ii) C is locally atomic over B_i^j with respect to P ;
- (iii) Every $L(C)$ -definable subset of P^M is $L(P^C)$ -definable.

Put $B_i^{j+1} = C$.

Thus B_i^j ($j < \omega$) are defined. Let $A_{i+1} = \bigcup_{j < \omega} B_i^j$. This completes Step i .

Put $M = \bigcup_{i < \omega} A_i$. By the construction of M , it is easy to show that M is a countable model of T by Tarski-Vaught test. By Fact 7 and the construction of A_{i+1} , $P^{A_{i+1}}$ is locally atomic over P^{A_i} . Then again by Fact 7, P^M is locally atomic over P^A . \square

COROLLARY 9. *If T is stable in P and not ω -stable in P , then there is a model M of cardinality \aleph_1 which has no indiscernible set of cardinality \aleph_1 in P^M .*

SKETCH OF PROOF. This argument is a simple generalization of Theorem A in [3]. We use partially locally atomic models instead of locally atomic models. Start with a certain countable set. By Theorem 6, we can construct an increasing chain of length ω_1 consisting of M_i 's such that each M_{i+1} is countable and locally atomic over $M_i\bar{a}_i$ with respect to P where \bar{a}_i is a suitable tuple. Then the union of this chain is a model we have been looking for. \square

Question. Is the countability condition on A in Theorem 6 necessary?

References

- [1] J. T. Baldwin. Fundamentals of Stability Theory. Springer-Verlag 1988.
- [2] S. Shelah. Classification Theory and the Number of Non-isomorphic models. North-Holland 1978.
- [3] A. Tsuboi. Large indiscernible sets of a Structure. Kobe J. Math., **10** (1993) 173–178.

Keishi Okamoto
Mathematical department,
graduate school of science and
engineering,
WASEDA University,
3-4-1, Ohkubo Shinjuku, Tokyo, 169
Japan,
E-mail: okamoto@logic.info.waseda.ac.jp

Kentaro Wakai
Institute of Mathematics,
University of Tsukuba,
Tsukuba-shi, Ibaraki, 305, Japan,
E-mail: wakai@math.tsukuba.ac.jp